

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-49 and 51-72 are pending. Applicant has amended claim 63 and cancelled claim 50. The Examiner has rejected the claims as follows:<sup>1</sup>

<b><u>Claims</u></b>	<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Reference</u></b>
12-13, 15-22	102(a)	Voit
1, 3-8, 23-26, 32-38	102(e)	Ryan
40-50, 53-57	102(e)	Gibson
40, 51-52	102(e)	Hakim
58-60, 64-66, 70	102(e)	Strentzsch
63	102(e)	Sitaraman
9	103(a)	Ryan, Andersen, and Huitema
10	103(a)	Ryan and Kapoor
11	103(a)	Ryan and Liu
14	103(a)	Voit and Chua
61-62, 67-68	103(a)	Strentzsch and Sitaraman
69	103(a)	Strentzsch and Huitema
71	103(a)	Strentzsch and Gibson
72	103(a)	Strentzsch, Gibson, and Fryer
2, 27, 39	103(a)	Ryan and Parker
28	103(a)	Ryan and Sitaraman

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Examiner has rejected claims 12-22 based at least in part on Voit. Voit is directed to a technique by which a party, that can be called by a voice over IP ("VoIP")

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner did not provide the basis for his rejection of claims 29-31. As such, applicant cannot respond to the rejection.

application of a browser, can specify the IP address to which the call can be placed. According to Voit, a domain name server maintains translation tables that map domain names to IP addresses and telephone numbers to IP addresses. (Voit, 9:64-10:8.) For example, one table may map "eric.voit@phone" to the IP address of Eric Voit, and another table may map "301-608-2908@phone" also to the IP address of Eric Voit. Thus, a person wanting to call Eric Voit can enter either "eric.voit@phone" or "301-608-2908@phone" to place the VoIP call.

Voit also describes that a table of the domain name server may also indicate that the translation may be conditional. For example, "eric.voit@phone" may map to rules set up by Eric Voit to indicate how to place calls. Eric Voit may set up a rule that directs the domain name server to send a query to a certain IP address (e.g., the IP address of the Eric Voit's computer) to determine whether he is currently online. If the domain name server receives no response, then the domain name server may return an indication that the call cannot be completed because Eric Voit is not online. Otherwise, the domain name server may return that certain IP address. (Voit, 11:58-12:52.) Voit also describes that a person can change their certain IP address to reflect their current location. For example, if the person switches to their laptop, then a message would be sent to the domain name server to change that certain IP address to the IP address of the laptop. (Voit, 13: 13-51.)

Claims 12-22, in contrast, recite "providing a domain name mapping of domain names to intermediate identifiers" and "providing an address mapping of intermediate identifiers to addresses." Voit neither teaches nor suggests the use of "intermediate identifiers." Rather, the translation tables of Voit translate from a domain name or a telephone number directly to an IP address without the use of an intermediate identifier.

The Examiner has rejected to the claims 1-11, 23-28, and 32-39 based at least in part on Ryan. Ryan is directed to a technique that allows multiple IP addresses to be associated with a domain name. For example, the domain name "smith.com" may be associated with the IP addresses for the Smith Electrical, Smith Plumbing, and Smith

Bakery. (Ryan, Fig. 1, n. 7.) When a user enters the domain name "smith.com," the user's browser sends the domain name to the domain name server. The domain name server detects that multiple IP addresses are associated with the domain name and returns a web page to the browser that contains links to the IP addresses. The user can then select the link of interest.

Claims 1-11, 23-26, and 32-38, in contrast, are directed using a "dynamic address system" to identify an address associated with a "dynamic address name." When a domain name server receives a domain name from a browser, it identifies the dynamic address name associated with domain name. The domain name server provides the dynamic address name to the dynamic address system, which identifies and returns an associated address. The domain name server then provides the returned address to the browser. Ryan neither teaches nor suggests associating a domain with a dynamic address name, which is in turn associated with an address. Rather, Ryan simply maps a domain name to multiple IP addresses.

The Examiner has rejected claims 40-49 and 53-57 based on Gibson. Gibson is directed to a technique by which a web page of an organization can be accessed using the telephone number of that organization. Gibson states "a business entity associated with content server 16 has previously registered this phone domain name and enjoys two channels of access. More particularly, the business entity associated with the content server 16 can be accessed by way of voice telephone channel of access by dialing a given numeric sequence and may be accessed by way of an Internet channel of access by entering the same numeric sequence as a phone domain name." (Gibson, ¶ 25.) A phone domain name is, for example, "208-344-5026.net." A person can dial the telephone number "208-344-5026" using a telephone to place a telephone call to the organization, and a person can enter "208-344-5026.net" via a web browser to access a web page of that organization.

Claims 40-49 are directed to "identifying an address of a telephone a server associated with the telephone number associated with the domain name" such that "when the client computer system accesses the identified address, a telephone call is placed to the telephone number associated with domain name." Gibson neither teaches nor suggests that a telephone call is placed to the telephone number associated with a domain. Gibson is not related to placing a telephone call over the Internet, rather it simply suggests that an organization can use a domain name that is derived from the organization's telephone.

Claims 53-57 are directed to a data structure that includes a top-level domain name and "on another level domain name that identifies a telephone number to be called when the domain name is specified." The Examiner merely states "[a] top-level domain name and another level domain name are not the data structure." (Office Action, October 7, 2004, p. 10.) Applicant requests clarification as to the basis of this rejection. The Examiner has pointed to nothing in Gibson as showing the elements of claims 53-57, but yet rejects these claims over Gibson. Thus, the Examiner has not established even a prima facie case of anticipation.

The Examiner has rejected the claims 40 and 51-52 based on Hakim. Hakim is directed to a technique for routing a telephone call from one telephone to another telephone via the Internet. When a caller places a telephone call using their telephone, an calling Internet Telephony Server ("ITS") associated with the calling number identifies an IP address of an called ITS associated with the called number. The call is routed between the calling ITS and the called ITS via the Internet. The called ITS directed the call to the telephone associated with the called number.

Claims 40 and 51-52 recite "receiving a domain name from a client computer." Applicant can find no reference to "domain name" or even "domain" in Hakim. Applicant respectfully requests clarification as to what in Hakim the Examiner believes corresponds a "domain name."

The Examiner has rejected claims 58-62 and 64-72 at least in part based on Strentzsch. These claims are directed to a technique for, when a domain name server does not have an address associated with a domain name received from a client computer, causing a "search engine" to run a search using the received domain name. The client computer is then provided information derived from the search. Normally, when an address is not associated with the domain name, the client computer presents the message "The Web site cannot be found" to the user. The use of a search engine allows more meaningful information to be provided to the user.

In rejecting these claims, the Examiner apparently believes that a traditional domain name server that receives a DNS query identifying a domain name and returns the IP address corresponds to that domain name is a "search engine." Applicant respectfully disagrees that such a domain name server is a search engine. The online computer dictionary Webopedia describes a "search engine" with the following:

Typically, a search engine works by sending out a spider to fetch as many documents as possible. Another program, called an indexer, then reads these documents and creates an index based on the words contained in each document. Each search engine uses a proprietary algorithm to create its indices such that, ideally, only meaningful results are returned for each query.

Examples of such search engines are Google, MSN Search, and Alta Vista. A domain name server is not a search engine. A domain name server does not search for and return documents that match a domain name. Rather, a domain name server simply checks its local mapping of domain names to IP addresses and may forward the request if not found. Although this may be considered in some sense to be searching, a domain name server is not a "search engine" as that term is used in the art.

The Examiner has rejected claim 63 based on Sitaraman. Although applicant disagrees applicant has amended claim 63 to make it more explicit that the accessing of

the alternate server computer is in place of accessing the server computer associated with the domain name.

Claim 63 is directed to a technique for providing to the client computer the address of an alternate server computer when there is no IP address associated with a domain name. As described above, normally, when an address is not associated with the domain name, the client computer presents the message "The Web site cannot be found" to the user. This technique allows the user to be directed to the alternate server computer, rather than just seeing the "cannot be found" message.

Sitaraman describes the conventional processing of a DNS server in which, when an IP address for a domain name is not found, the DNS server returns the address of another DNS server to the client. The client can then send a DNS query to the other DNS server to try to find the IP address for the domain name. Such sending of a query is not the access of an alternate server computer in place of the server computer associated with the domain name as now recited by the claim. Rather, it is simply further attempts to locate the server computer associated with the domain name. If the attempts ultimately fail, the user is presented with the "cannot be found" message.

The Examiner has objected to the drawing. Applicant is resubmitting the formal drawings to replace the previous formal drawings that omitted numerals that were on the drawings as originally filed.

Applicant has corrected a minor typographical in paragraph 32 of the specification.

The Examiner has rejected claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶, as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The claimed data structure "comprises" a top level domain name and another level domain name that identifies a telephone number to be called. Applicant requests clarification as to what the Examiner means by "the first level and another level of the domain name are not a data structure." (Office Action, October 7, 2004, p. 3)

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶, as being indefinite. The Examiner states that "a certain amount of time" lack some standard for measure. Applicant respectfully disagrees. It is well known that domain name servers can specify a time for caching domain name to IP address mappings. One skilled in the art would understand this phrase to mean any amount of time as specified by a server.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Dated: April 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8000  
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant